

## REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7 and 10 have been amended, Claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 9 and 11 have been canceled, leaving Claims 1, 4, 6, 7 and 10 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment.

The term "said" has universally been amended to "the" to provide consistency in the style of claiming.

Support for the amendment to Claims 1 and 7 can at least be found in the originally filed claims and in the specification, for example, at page 6.

Support for the amendment to Claim 6 can at least be found in the specification at page 4.

Claim 4 has been amended to correct the dependency of the claim, since Claim 3 has been canceled.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 (b) & (e)

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Otsuki et al. (U.S. 6,737,176).

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b), as being allegedly anticipated by Yamada et al. (JP Patent No. 2000-173766).

These rejections are moot in light of Applicants' claim amendments.

Independent Claims 1 and 7 claim, *inter alia*, the following element: "the moisture absorbent grains are CaO grains having a grain size of 0.1  $\mu\text{m}$  to 10  $\mu\text{m}$  and a coefficient of thermal expansion of  $5 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $25 \times 10^{-6}$ , and the adhesive is a thermoplastic resin having a coefficient of thermal expansion of  $100 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $200 \times 10^{-6}$ ."

With this claimed structure, as shown in the graph of Fig. 4, even when a desiccant having a grain size of 0.1  $\mu\text{m}$  to 10  $\mu\text{m}$  is mixed to the sealing resin, the occurrence of a crack can be inhibited.

Otsuki and Yamada fail to disclose how the coefficient of thermal expansion of the desiccant and the acrylic resin are set. Since Otsuki and Yamada each fail to disclose the

claimed coefficient of thermal expansion of the desiccant and the acrylic resin, Otsuki and Yamada fail to teach each and every element of Applicants' independent Claims 1 and 7. Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 7 are not anticipated and are therefore allowable. Moreover, as dependent claims from an allowable independent claim, Claims 4 and 10 are, by definition, also allowable.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otsuki et al in view of Hishida (U.S. Patent No. 6,861,802).

In making this rejection, the Examiner relied upon Hishida primarily for teaching the desiccant being formed in the shape of a spiral on a surface of the sealing substrate.

However, Hishida fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference Otsuki in view of Applicants' claim amendments. More particularly, even if combined, the combined references at least fail to teach or suggest the claimed coefficient of thermal expansion of the desiccant and the acrylic resin. As such, independent Claim 1 is not obvious and is therefore allowable. As a dependent claim from an allowable independent claim, Claim 6 is, by definition, also allowable.

Nevertheless, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 6 is further patentably distinct over Claim 1. More particularly, Hishida fails to disclose that the desiccant has a width of approximately 1000  $\mu\text{m}$  to 2000  $\mu\text{m}$ . With Applicants' claimed structure, peeling of the desiccant from the substrate due to stress can be inhibited. For at least these reasons, Claim 6 is not obvious and is therefore allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Joel T. Charlton

Registration No. 52,721

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone (404) 607-9991

Facsimile (404) 607-9981

Customer No. 23413

Dated: December 9, 2005